

The Sun

WILLIAM M. LAFAN.

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 27, 1902.

Subscriptions by Mail, Postpaid.

DAILY, Per Month	\$0.50
DAILY, Per Year	5.00
SUNDAY, Per Year	2.00
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Year	6.00
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Month	.50
Postage to foreign countries added.	

THE SUN, NEW YORK CITY.

PARIS—Boulevard No. 12, near Grand Hotel, and Boulevard No. 10, Boulevard des Capucines.

If our friends who favor us with manuscripts for publication wish to have their articles returned, they must in all cases send stamps for that purpose.

Better Than Alimony.

For some days past there has been on trial in the City Court before Judge SKARBY and a jury an extraordinary action brought by one JULIA REEL against a business man, reputed to be wealthy, named WARREN B. SMITH. The plaintiff first met the defendant in June last year, and subsequently, they travelled abroad together. She sued to recover two installments of a life allowance of \$300 a month, which she claimed the defendant had promised last January to pay her as a compromise of a threatened suit for breach of promise of marriage.

She received thereafter \$300 a month down to July, or \$1,800 in all, when the payment stopped, and she commenced her action. The plaintiff testified that she warned the defendant that she would sue him for breach of promise and that he replied: "Don't do that, JULIE, I'll take care of you; I'll allow you \$300 a month for life," and a letter subsequently written by the defendant was put in evidence, in which, among other things, he wrote: "I shall send you a cheque for \$300 on the 1st of February, and \$300 on the 1st of each month afterwards."

If this recovery can be sustained, it would mean the recovery of an income of \$3,600 a year from Mr. SMITH, which, as the plaintiff is a young woman, might, according to the life tables, amount to over \$100,000, a sum more ample than any allowance of alimony to an injured wife.

It would have been more economical for Mr. SMITH to marry his JULIE off-hand and try to get rid of her afterward.

It is evident that the relation between the plaintiff and defendant had an illegal inception, because it was against good morals. Two questions of law, therefore, arise:

Does the character of the relation make any difference, provided the payment was the result of a compromise? And it is argued that because the Appellate Division of this department held that an agreement to pay the debt of another had a good consideration when viewed as a compromise of a disputed claim, therefore, an agreement to pay money for forbearing to sue for breach of promise can be enforced, no matter what was the basis of the original relation between the parties.

Another question of law is: Does not the first recovery become a bar to any future action for subsequently accruing installments? The imagination is dazzled at the enormous vista of possible and prudent litigation which will be opened if this judgment becomes the established law.

The Killing of Mrs. Gore.

A beautiful young American woman, Mrs. GORE, was killed in Paris, a few days ago, in the apartment of a Russian barytone named RYZEWSKI. She had been studying music for some time in Paris, was in moderate circumstances, and although she had been divorced from her husband, since her death he has testified that she was a woman of exemplary character.

RYZEWSKI was being pursued by Mrs. GORE with his devotion for some time, and it would appear from letters written by the deceased to her aunt in this country, that the attentions of the Russian were not agreeable and that because of his peculiar character Mrs. GORE was in fear of danger.

Little is known of the actual occurrence, because only two human beings were in the apartment when the fatal shot was fired, which it is conceded came from a revolver belonging to the Russian. The ball entered the extreme right of Mrs. GORE's right eye, cutting the ligaments behind the eye, forcing it out, and emerging at the left side of the head.

The Russian said that he was lying on the bed, fully dressed, while Mrs. GORE was seated at the foot of the bed, her legs hanging down on the side nearest the wall, and her body thrown backward on the feather quilt which had been rolled to form a cushion. Wishing to take something from the night table, he knocked off the revolver, which went off and the bullet struck Mrs. GORE in the face.

It is stated that Mrs. GORE had gone to the apartment of the singer in answer to a telegram which he had sent her that morning.

The idea of suicide, of course, is not for one moment tenable, and the only question in the case is "Did RYZEWSKI murder Mrs. GORE, or was her death accidental?"

On Monday last the State Department instructed the American Consul-General at Paris to institute a thorough investigation into the cause of Mrs. GORE's death, and pursuant to such request Mr. GOWDY appointed four American doctors to make an examination of the body and submit a report to him. The physicians were Dr. A. J. MAGNIN of the American Hospital in Paris, Dr. EDMUND L. GROS, Dr. WHITMAN of the Equitable Life Assurance Society, and Dr. TRENER.

It has been stated that the American physicians did not make an autopsy, but accepted the autopsy of the French doctor, and that their report will be

based upon a geometrical demonstration of the probability that the killing was accidental and was caused by the falling of the revolver on the floor, as stated by the prisoner. But these American doctors are not mathematical experts; they are simply doctors, whose testimony is only valuable because they are physicians or surgeons, and it is not their business to make a report based on alleged mathematical demonstration in regard to which they are no more experts than an ordinary layman would be.

The great danger of the whole situation is that, proper independent work may not be done in this matter, and that the so-called examination or investigation may not have been conducted with sufficient critical or detective capacity. It is a case calling for SHERLOCK HOLMES, and some man of that character should be employed to supervise the doctors.

Mr. Roosevelt and the Trusts.

Why is it that a considerable part of the intelligent press of the United States is now assuming, with a positiveness warranted by President ROOSEVELT's recent utterances on the subject, that his forthcoming message will echo that vague clamor against the trusts, and repeat those inchoate proposals of Federal interference with the larger business activities of the country, which were formerly the discredited stock-in-trade of demagogues?

Why is it, in other words, that the people are now expecting from THEODORE ROOSEVELT about the same sort of message, on this particular topic, as WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN might have sent to Congress last Divine Providence, for the nation's sins, seen fit to bestow upon him that opportunity.

We have never impugned the sincerity of Mr. ROOSEVELT's motives in attacking the corporations. To impute to him the mere design of attaining popularity, or securing to himself the suffrage of the people, is, with our knowledge of his character, impossible. His popularity before he launched upon this course was beyond assay; the suffrage of the nation was his well-won prerogative—inalienable save by his own act.

It is time that there should be in the White House and elsewhere, at least among men of sense, some better understanding of the trusts and the facts concerning them. There is no phrase, for example, that is more current in our mouths than "the evils of the trusts." The President has dwelt upon it until it has sunk into the marrow of the public and has become a conspicuous element of common belief and conviction.

What are these evils? They do not exist outside the phrase itself. And yet it is taken for granted that they do exist and a vast number of people believe implicitly that they are there, although no sane or truthful man can specify or describe them! The nearest charge that will lie against the trusts is that they are monopolies; and yet not one of them is a monopoly. Not one of them could by any human possibility be a monopoly and remain such any longer than was physically necessary for capital to dispute the field with it. Where is the trust that is a monopoly at this moment? There is not one.

Monopolies are not of our time. Barbaric potentates confer monopolies and protect and shelter them, for a consideration; but in free America they cannot exist save when they are created and sanctioned by the Government of the United States through its Patent laws as the reward of human ingenuity.

The trusts are no new thing. They have existed for hundreds of years before the memory of living man. Mr. CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS has shown that the monopolies which sovereigns conferred on their favorites were trusts, absolute trusts, but that the powerloom was equally the most overwhelming of trusts. A trust has for the very essence of its being its ability to produce cheaply and enormously, and it must sell more cheaply than any one else can or its existence will end. No trust has survived which has increased the price of a commodity. Many have attempted it and all of them have gone to wreck and ruin. No interposition by Federal or State authority was needed. Natural law supervened, and it always will supervene.

It supervened in the case of the sewing machine, which was, from a sentimental point of view, the cruellest of trusts, crueler far than the powerloom; and it supervened in the case of all the great trusts, all the great economic revolutions which the brain of man has conceived and imposed upon civilized humanity.

If Mr. ROOSEVELT will look to history, will allow the past to illuminate the present, he will surely determine that it had been as wise to seek to regulate the sewing machine by an amendment to the Constitution as to follow that course in the case of the trusts of our own time.

THE SUN has steadfastly pointed out, from the very beginning of this intellectual disturbance, that the trusts were an inevitable evolution of the age, and that no power could stop their development unless it substituted social chaos in their places. No unjust, dishonest or oppressive trust can live very long. The common law and the law of nature are fatal to it.

And then, too, THE SUN has always had and ever will have, please God, an

ineradicable faith in the common sense of the American people.

The Rewards of Politics.

The appointment of BYRNE as United States District Attorney in Delaware was based, says the authoritative declaration from the White House, on "excellent service for the public good" and "staunch support of the President when he ran for Governor and afterward." If the appointment is intended merely to repay a personal debt of President ROOSEVELT's to Mr. BYRNE, comment would be superfluous. Inasmuch, however, as the official reasons for BYRNE's preference are largely interpreted as a recognition of his services to the Republican party simply, apart from what special assistance he may have given to the President, those services happen to be of a nature so peculiar that it is worth while to describe them. Otherwise Republicans ambitious to serve their country in civil posts would be without the proper sailing directions to their desired haven.

BYRNE, after having been originally appointed by President McKINLEY from the anti-Addicks faction, took up with ADDICKS. From that moment, instead of being an independent patriot, he became a subordinate of unbending humility. So completely was he at ADDICKS's orders that he resigned the office he held in the Republican name to make a three-cornered fight for a seat in Congress without rational hope of success. He permitted himself to be nominated for the purpose of preventing the reelection of Delaware's Republican Congressman, BALL, an enterprise in which, while BALL's defeat was probable, BYRNE's election was impossible.

"Mr. ADDICKS authorized us to say that the Union Republicans would prefer to see a Democratic Congressman elected rather than Mr. BALL." That is from the *Wilmington Sun* of Oct. 10, which carries standing under the first headline of its editorial page: "J. EDWARD ADDICKS, Editor."

With such a statement in Mr. ADDICKS's own organ there can be no question of the accuracy of the subjoined report from the *Wilmington Morning News*, of the same date as the *Wilmington Sun* from which we have quoted:

"From statements made by J. EDWARD ADDICKS in this city on Wednesday afternoon it seems evident that the object of nominating WILLIAM MICHAEL BYRNE for Congress principally was to cause the defeat of Congressman L. HENRIER BALL, so that Mr. ADDICKS might try to get the dispensing of Federal patronage in Delaware."

"Mr. ADDICKS later said: 'The next Congress must from Delaware will be a Democrat, and I will then control the Federal patronage.'"

"Secretary of State LAYTON, while in this city on Tuesday night to attend the meeting at the Opera House, had no hesitancy in saying that Mr. BYRNE was nominated to cause the defeat of Congressman BALL."

Thus blew the trumpets of purpose and defiance. The note of triumph appeared in the *Philadelphia Public Ledger* two days after election day:

"To the Editor of the Public Ledger: . . . We have taken upon the temptation of Federal patronage by existing from the situation Congressman BALL, who betrayed our confidence."

Two questions come up, for Republicans seeking office as the reward of party service and for members of the Republican party in general who defend the principle that to the victors belong the spoils.

Does BYRNE's last performance in politics, thus disclosed, constitute the degree or kind of party service that deserves the recompense of office?

If not, were BYRNE's services to Mr. ROOSEVELT, personally, sufficient to outweigh his defeat of the Republican party's Representative from Delaware?

How to Live on \$300 a Year.

The plunge of Prof. J. SCOTT CLARK of the Northwestern University into political economy has made a pleasing splash in Illinois. Reporters and statisticians are pushing his front-door bell early and often. "You say a single man or woman can live comfortably on \$300 a year, professor. Will you kindly send 'itemized' bills?" Then professor rubs his eye-glasses and looks weary. Cook county professors are chartered libertines in the matter of talk. Personally we should never think of examining a poet in the table of logarithms. But Chicago rarely likes to pester professors. Prof. CLARK gives this list of a single man's expenses for a year:

Board and lodging, at \$2 a week. . . \$104
Clothing (one suit, two pairs of trousers, overcoat and sundries). . . 85
Laundry, carfare and other sundries. . . 61
Total. . . \$250

In this part of the world folks don't expect to find cheap board and lodging except in a poorhouse, jail or similar institution. In "expensive Evanston," as Prof. CLARK calls it, happier conditions prevail. Many students club together for their board, and their food "costs between \$1 and \$1.50 per head each week," and yet they have all-devouring appetites that have driven thousands of boarding-house keepers to despair and bankruptcy. When two or more Evanston students room together, each pays about 50 cents a week. Yet Evanston is called "expensive." Probably it will be so before long. Millions of savings souls will settle there. Prof. CLARK believes that Chicago is ahead of Evanston as a saving centre; and that Chicago bachelors can live on \$200 and lay up whatever they earn in excess of that amount. Still, he is afraid that "should all the young men in Chicago commence living on that schedule to-morrow, two-thirds of the saloons and the vaudeville shows would be closed within the week."

This shows us the bad side of economy. Much as we may commend frugality, can we wish to throw all those variety people and that great host of barkeepers out of work?

How is it with the unmarried working girl? The professor is a little doubtful. He thinks that her clothes would cost \$50 to \$75 a year. But her expenditures for necessities will be less than the young man's; and she doesn't eat as much.

The *Chicago Tribune* has interviewed a laundryman who lives in Goethe street

with his wife and two children, under 4. Their annual bills are:

Rent of three rooms, at \$2 a month	\$208
Food for four persons, at about \$5 per week	260
Gas bill	30
Clothing for four persons	50
Total	\$548

The *Inter Ocean* says the ordinary workman in Evanston gets \$2.50 a day and it seems to resent Prof. CLARK's plan as if it meant a reduction of wages. There is no danger that any great number of persons will stick for more than two weeks to any effort for saving. After Christmas most of us feel poor and virtuous and determined to save something or more next year. Those resolutions will be as false as dicers' oaths. The American temperament is happy-go-lucky; and few of us think that anything is too good for us. Most of us have to live within our means, but here and there is a financial genius who lives habitually beyond them, eats the fat and drinks the sweet and bids care and creditors go hang. His recipe would be interesting.

It is clear that the domestic servant, help, maid or man, really saves more in proportion than anybody else in the community. Say a maid's wages are \$4 a week. Clothes and a little carfare are about her only other necessary expenses. And it is a great mistake to believe that domestic service is not consistent with extreme personal independence.

Prof. CLARK's theory is that, if you are single, you can live in health and comfort on \$300 a year and lay up \$100. We wish he would try it for a year. Experience is the best demonstration. Does the professor shave himself? Did he ever keep account of his laundry bills for a year? Has he noticed the ravages of laundresses and laundry men? Has he known a philosopher who existed in this town on more than twice the professor's allowance. He could shave himself, but he had a weakness for clean linen. "At the end of the year," said he mournfully, "I had but one shirt and a part of that was painfully visible to persons walking behind me."

The Belmont Park Racetrack.

No more welcome news has come to the ears of horsemen and the admirers of thoroughbreds generally than that made public last Tuesday to the effect that the finest racetrack ever seen in this country, if not, indeed, in the world, is soon to be built at Queens, on Long Island, Belmont Park, the name which the Westchester Racing Association has selected for its new track, will embody all that has been found by experience to be desirable in a thoroughly equipped course.

Belmont Park will be more than a racetrack in the ordinary sense of that word. It will be a place suited to the stabling and breaking and training of yearlings; it will afford ample facilities for holding great annual breeding sales, and, moreover, its commodious clubhouse will constitute a sort of headquarters where horsemen may gather either for social or business purposes. For the best interests of the turf a place such as Belmont Park promises to be has long been needed, and this need has been felt during the past few years in proportion to the increasing popularity of racing. The trip to Belmont Park should be made in about three-quarters of an hour from the Manhattan end of the Bridge.

With every racetrack there are linked associations and customs, not to say superstitions, which it is hard to analyze, and these Morris Park has in common. But with the promises of another course three times as large as the old one and surpassing it in every essential particular, to be ready for use within a year and a half from the present time, no one should grieve over the disappearance of the Westchester track.

Former Senator GEORGE L. SHORR is the first to make formal announcement, personally at least, of his candidacy for the United States Senate in Idaho to succeed Mr. HENRIER BALL, the Democratic incumbent. Last Lake Tahoe.

Then no other need apply. SHORR will do.

The weight carried by the American soldier in heavy order is disclosed by the Chief of Ordnance in his annual report when he discusses the problem of the modern fighting tool. He says that one of our infantrymen carries an equipment of 76 pounds 15 1/2 ounces, so that he marches not so much more lightly than his foreign brothers in the military service. His equipment, in its details, weighs these amounts: Undershirt, 1 pound 2 ounces; drawers, 1 pound; socks, 3/4 ounce; blue shirt, 1 pound 4 ounces; trousers, 2 pounds; shoes, 2 pounds 5 ounces; leggings, 8 1/2 ounces; blouse, 2 pounds 4 ounces; campaign hat, 6 ounces; woven belt, 1 pound 9 ounces; 200 cartridges, 13 pounds 8 ounces; rifle, 16 pounds 1 ounce; bayonet, 1 pound; scabbard, 1 1/2 ounces; blanket bag, 2 pounds 4 1/2 ounces; overcoat, 7 pounds; blanket, 5 pounds; shelter tent, 2 pounds 8 1/2 ounces; poncho, 2 pounds, 12 ounces; extra shoes, 2 pounds 5 ounces; extra drawers, 1 pound; extra socks, 3/4 ounce; towel, 5 ounces; toilet articles, 5 ounces; haversack and straps, 1 pound 9 1/2 ounces; meat can, 15 ounces; knife, fork and spoon, 6 ounces; 8 days' rations, 6 pounds; canteen, 1 1/2 pounds; tin cup, 1 pound 3 1/2 ounces; and tin cup, 5 ounces. A good deal of weight to pack, even though one-sixth of it is worn on the person; but that intrinsically it is needed, and probably will have to be added to the burden.

When President ROOSEVELT summoned six gentlemen as representatives of six coal companies to meet JOHN MICHELL, as the representative of one labor company, the contrast between the division of capital and the consolidation of labor was very striking. Yesterday the names of thirty additional coal companies were added to that list, and six operators in the field in which MICHELL has aimed at the entire monopoly as to labor.

Puzzle: Find the coal trust.

The coal problem is not in process of settlement. It is simply in process of being patched up. Stringent Federal action.

What drowsy syrup of the East makes our contemporary dream its dream of settlement? How can the coal problem or any other industrial problem be "settled" before it dies? Settlements will come with the millennium.

Oaths of the Crowd.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN:—"Heavens to Betsy" has been one of mine for sixty years at least. I do not know of any other. I probably took it from one of my parents, but of whom I am not in Connecticut. C. C. G.

NEW YORK WATER COLOR CLUB.

Second Notice.

Since one's first visit to the exhibition a special grouped display has been made of water colors by Winslow Homer. What a master he is! Even before one approaches near enough to study the individual pictures their aggregate effect communicates an exhilaration, for brightness of feeling, directness of expression and spontaneous force carry their message even from a distance. And the nearer view sustains the impression. He manipulates the medium with extraordinary skill, but no trick is involved. The skill directly follows from his method of attack, and the main feature of that is the concentrated intensity with which he rivets his attention on some one aspect or mood of the scene, brushing all trivialities aside in his straight, keen realization of the essentials, which, once powerfully realized, he renders with that quick correspondence of eye and hand that intuition and practice have made possible. One may be the more assured that this is the secret of his strength by studying an early example, "Wreck of the English Coast," painted as far back as 1881. In the middle distance a bark is tossing helplessly against a background of misty sea and heavy slate-colored sky, while the tumult of waves in front of it is lifeboat is approaching. In his rendering of the wreck and laden sky one can see how the painter has been aroused, but equally we can see that he has not yet mastered the art of simplification, of instinctively discarding the essentials, in the way he has rendered the waves in front. They have tremendous energy of movement, but their surface is overlaid with the scum and swirl of foam, rendered with such laborious precision that it has the stiff cramped appearance of a curled wig. In this elaboration of detail much of the main significance of the scene is lost. It is chiefly by comparing this example with the later ones that we realize the comparative degrees and discover, as the artist himself has done, that intensity of purpose logically leads to that directness which involves simplification.

What strides he had made toward this even as early as 1885 may be seen in the "Cockfight." The object of definition is the victorious bird, straightening his throat in the effort of triumph, his figure all the more starkly distinct that the plumage has been torn from his back, and a mere residuum of tail feathers fan themselves out ridiculously from the stump of flesh. Below him lies his adversary, a mass of limp plumage, dragged and dusty, while the air of dust and floating feathers is still surrounding the group. It is an extraordinary bit of impressionistic painting—most complete and vivid.

We need not be reminded how important a part is played by the white paper in Homer's water colors; how the paper to the top note in the scale of light to which he has raised all the other tones, but there is a striking example here in "A Land Mark," a rambling old house, a white or dove gray according as it catches sun or shadow, standing at the summit of a greenish-yellow knoll with a sky behind it of slaty blue. How the glare and heat of tropical sunshine are expressed! For the scene is in Bermuda, and this penetrating, pervasive light, we discover to be suggested by a few tones, washed broadly in, skillfully chosen and juxtaposed so as to increase by illusion the actual qualities of the white paper.

Similarly, in "Saguenay River—Grand Débarcadere," the suggestion of rolling crests that ride down the rush of water, forced from below by the pressure and spray, is mainly the paper in reserve; shaded in the hollows with a thin wash of reddish brown. It is in this way that the artist secures an energy and snap that no amount of overlying with white pigment could produce. There is certainly another reason which makes this method so stirring to the eye, a psychological one. It is the result of the picture having been clearly and completely comprehended in the artist's brain before brush is put to paper. He sees his picture completed before he starts to paint, and then marches straight and swiftly to his conclusion; and the consciousness of such comprehensive and immediate realization acts as a stimulus to our own imagination. His masterful enthusiasm is contagious.

As a consequence of execution following so rapidly and surely upon the conception, there is never a tired or fumbled passage in the picture and the colors are always pure, sparkling and translucent—gemlike. How beautiful is Homer's sense of color, appearing, perhaps, most markedly in his rendering of water, especially in the liquid depths of blue and green, tones that in nature reappear in the crevasses of a glacier, but which in their grandest beauty must be sought for in the ocean, since then to tone are added the further charms of movement and transparency.

And with what subtleties of suggestion! He renders these qualities in most impressive manner, to be sure, in his oil paintings, but in the water colors with a closely personal expression of himself, that gives them their particular value. For it would be impossible to get closer to the workings and the preferences of the artist's mind than through these water colors. No interval of time or barrier of technical bewilderments separates us from the moment of his inspiration. It and himself—his artistic entity I mean—are intimately revealed.

Among pictures of the sea is Charles H. Woodbury's "From the Cliff," quite beautiful in color, but with little suggestion of liquidity and movement. On the other hand, in Ben Foster's "Small Point, Maine," the tumultuousness of the water as it swirls in and out between the low, jagged rocks, seethed into foam and tossing flecks of spray, is admirably rendered, while there is humanity in sea and sky, a fine expression of wind and weather. Nor can one fail to be struck with Robert Arthur's virile treatment of the ocean sweeping in large eddies round some isolated crag of dark rock; yet the slide down of the water in front, as if it would escape from the frame, is hardly satisfactory.

Sunny and spontaneous, smacking delightfully of the open air, is "The Boat Yard, Provincetown," by Rhoda Holmes Nicholls; and with the picture is simple and unaffected and, so convincing. I cannot feel that Dodge Macknight's examples of the purity and harmony of color in "Blanche Dillaye's work," in "Evening," for example, and "The River," nor are they

without a very real charm of heartfelt sentiment. Among the contributions by ladies are "The Bait Basket" by Margaret Fernie Eaton, a very clever character study, with an artistic treatment of lighting; a still-life, "Peppers," by E. M. Scott, and the interior of a book shop, "Hubbys," by Alethea Hill Platts, seen with all the discernment of an artistic vision and particularly good in tone. Again there is a "Portrait," by Paula B. Himmelsbach, in which it would appear (for it is sketched) that pastel has been used in combination with the water color. At any rate, it grows in color, and so far, unobtrusive; yet there is no mistaking the force and character revealed. Similarly, sterling qualities again show themselves in "Thunderclouds," by Arvid Nyholm, though one may have to confess an inability to accept the construction and color of the sky as reminiscent of nature. But this little picture is present the evidence of a painter seeing for himself and feeling his impression strongly.

A fine example of the possibilities of water color carried to a finity of expressiveness is to be seen in Charles P. Gruppe's "Morning in Laren," while Cole Campbell Cooper's "Snow, Laren, Holland," despite the loss of luminosity by the disregard of poor colors, conveys an impression of the character of the little village and the pensive quiet of the hush of snow that is quite irresistible. The exhibition will remain open until Dec. 14, and is too good one to be overlooked by anyone interested in this particular branch of art.

The Dog Speaks.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN:—Sir: The resolution now before the Board of Aldermen to drive the dog out of town is one that hits the people harder, perhaps, than any other that is responsible for the resolution are even willing to consider. May I ask for space in your paper to say a few words as an unprejudiced observer of the happiness of the very poor?

The dwellers in the tenement and apartment houses do not all of them keep dogs. Some do and some do not. A nuisance to neighbors should be complained of to the persons in authority. No one is obliged to suffer a nuisance any longer than he wishes. But the man who keeps his dog to himself and family ought not to be disturbed by the happiness he takes in a pet. The argument that the fear of hydrophobia should deter persons from keeping a dog is so absurd, so ignorant, that a physician would not think it worth his while to say a word about it. How many cases of hydrophobia are there in New York to-day? How many contagious diseases have been found by the Board of Health traceable to the dogs of the people in the tenements and the apartment houses? A contagious disease is as transmissible by a dog as by any number of dogs. Contagious diseases are not spread by dogs. In the apartment houses, and a law to quarantine them as I believe.

No unjust, so absurd, so unfeeling a law as the proposed ordinance should be compared to the ordinance of the city of New York, which protects the people from the nuisance of diseased animals running in the streets. There is already a law to the effect that all dogs shall be licensed and shall wear a collar with the license number. The Board of Health, in insisting on keeping a diseased dog on his premises, where he is not allowed to run at large, is protecting the health of the people. It is a protection which the Board of Health is entitled to give. The people, then, the unjustified right to a pet animal which causes untold happiness to them and harm to no one at all.

NEW YORK, Nov. 25. UNRECORDED.

"Power" and "Power." "We" and "We."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN:—Sir: I cannot perceive any contradiction or confusion of meaning in the various extracts from the President's recent speeches quoted in your editorial of this morning entitled "Who Has Laid Suggested That the Power Is Lacking?"

In the President's speech of Nov. 22 he evidently refers to the power of the people to control industry and commerce by influencing the enactment of proper laws to that effect.

In his previous speeches, from which you also quote, he refers to the need of such laws and that "power must be given, probably through a constitutional amendment, to the National Government to exercise in full supervision and regulation of these great enterprises."

In other words, when the President says "We have the power," he refers to the people of the United States, and when he continues "and we shall not fail to use it," he refers to the legislative branch of our government.

NEW YORK, Nov. 25. WALTER DAVIS, JR.

The Stockman on Tariff Revision.

From the *Kansas City Journal*.

"Our association does not dabble in politics," said Secretary Martin of the Live Stock Association yesterday. "But when a direct attack is made upon our interests we lay up to protect ourselves. To put hides and wool on the free list would work at immense loss to more than 500,000 farmers and stockmen throughout the country."

Thanksgiving.

Thank God for Love. Though one kind heart alone Responds with true affection to your own, Though all beside unheeding pass you by, Yet still divine blessing thrills your earthy sky.

Thank God for Life. Though rough the path you know, Though well acquainted with poverty and woe, While you at morn the day's fair face behold, While night still spreads her pomp of rose and gold.

Thank God for Death. After the summer hours Beneath the snow sleep all the weary fowls: So, after all life's pain and joys are past, Shall Death bring kindly rest for all at last.

Thank God for Death! SKEETHE M. LOWATER.

What's that you say? Thanksgiving day? Thanksgiving day? Great Scott.

What have we got To be thankful for? Look at this country: Young and great And strong as the strongest Old time state: Leading the bunch, And just begun The wonder of the world is yet to run. Wide as the world is, It will hold The earth and its fulness There's nothing in that To ring a thank at, Is there?

Look at our people, Brain and brawn, Getting to work With their harness on: Ready and willing And able to show All other nations The way to go. What they have the best They can get. There's nothing too good For them, you bet. There's nothing in that To ring a thank at, Is there?

Look all around you: Measure the girth Of land and the sea That encircle the earth: Can you find any people, Any country, like ours? And pumpkin pie live In its gardens of flowers? Is there anywhere, Anywhere, this side of Blaspheming eternal, A country like this? Is there one where the turkey And pumpkin pie live For no other reason Than the pleasure they give To thousands of thousands? And none is so poor He can't get a bite. At the wide open door, There's nothing in that To ring a thank at, Is there?

W. J. LAMPTON.

SENATOR FRYE'S VIEWS.

strong for ship subsidy bill—opposed to tariff revision.

WASHINGTON, Nov. 25.—Senator Frye of Maine, President pro tem. of the Senate, says he is more than ever before in favor of a subsidy for American shipping.

"The syndicate," he said, "has purchased a lot of old ships. In the next few years they will have to build 100,000 tons of new ships. If we authorize a subsidy, those new ships will be built in the United States; if not, they will be built abroad."

In regard to the tariff Senator Frye said: "Talk of tariff revision is absurd. The country is in the midst of great prosperity. Why should we speak of tariff revision? Legislation which would disarrange business relations and certainly cause depression over the country?"

"Is there no demand for it in New England?"